



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/611,463	07/07/2000	Eugene Amdur	DSC-002	6431
7733	7590	05/06/2004	EXAMINER	
WALKER & JOCKE, L.P.A. 231 SOUTH BROADWAY STREET MEDINA, OH 44256			TRAN, ELLEN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/611,463

Applicant(s)

AMDUR ET AL.

Examiner

Ellen C Tran

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

NORMAN M. WRIGHT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: amendment filed

10 March 2004 with recognition of a filing date of 19 April 2000.

2. Applicant's election with traverse, Group III (Claims 5-11) in Paper No. 5. The traversal is on the grounds that the Office has not shown: proof of a serious burden, or that the subcombinations have utility other than in the disclosed combination by way of example, or legal proper test for imposing restriction because the claims are independent and distinct. This is not found persuasive because the burden is caused by the different methods of providing computer security and assisting computer security: Group I is directed to a computer security service with policy builder, with database component with validator component which is different from Group II which is an interface for a computer security service with grid, with user labels, with resource labels. Groups I and II are different than Group III which is directed to a computer security service with a policy builder with a web-based delegated administration. The independent claims themselves are evidence that the groups can be used individually. In the independent claims of Group I and II there is not any dependency for a web-based delegation. In the independent claims of Group I and III there is no detailed description of a GUI with grid and labels. Finally in the independent claims of Group II and III there is no description on a database or validator component.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

3. Claims 5-11 are currently pending in this application. Claim 5 is an independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 5-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flint et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,453,419 (hereinafter '419) in further view of USING MICROSOFT® FRONTPAGE™ written by Neil Randall and Dennis Jones Copyright© 1996 by Que® Corporation (hereinafter FRONTPAGE).

As to independent claim 5, "A computer security service for a computer network accessible by users and comprising services and resources, the computer security service comprising, a policy builder component available to one or more policy managers," is taught in '419 col. 2, lines 6-42 "The present invention is a system and method of implementing a security policy, comprising the steps of providing a plurality of access policies, defining a process and connecting the access policies and the process to form a security policy. According to another aspect of the present invention, an access control mechanism is described in a computer network having a plurality of separate networks" (i.e. "building" same as "defining") (i.e. "one or more policy managers" implied in "plurality of networks");

"for defining access policies for the computer network users, services and resources, and" is disclosed in '419 col. 4, lines 14-36 "In one such embodiment, ACLs consist of all the required kernel code ... Also included are the system calls that the

user level programs need to use ... The first, Services node 60, decides which service(s) the rule will control" (i.e. "resources" same as "programs");

"the delegated administration component comprising a graphical user interface available to users for defining said access policies" is taught in 'col. 2, lines 51-52 "FIGS. 61-6d, 7, and 8 show how an access control rule is built in an graphical user interface (GUI) system";
the following is not taught in '419:

"a web-based delegated administration component accessible to users for defining access policies for the computer network users, services and resources," however FRONTPAGE pages 94-101 teaches "Setting Administrator, Author, and User Permission ... This process is valuable if you want to set up a Web whereby purchasers of your service or product" in pages 94-101.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a security service for a computer network taught in '419 to include a web-based administration component. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to design web pages and utilize the Internet see FRONTPAGE, page 2 "Putting together a site hasn't been as easy as it might be, though. Until very recently, setting one up required not only an Internet connection but also some pretty specialized knowledge about how Webs are built and maintained and the ability to create the pages of the Web site using a language called Hypertext Markup Language (HTML). Not everyone who wanted a Web site had that knowledge and

ability or the time or desire to acquire them. This is where Microsoft FrontPage steps into the breach”.

As to dependent claim 6, “in which the delegated administration component is implemented as a service supported by the computer security service.” is taught in ‘419 col. 12, lines 1-7 “There are a number of possible WWW Filters”

As to dependent claim 7, “in which the graphical user interface comprises one or more HTML format pages accessible to users.” is shown in FRONTPAGE page 170 “FrontPage Editor generates the HTML code automatically as you put things onto your page”.

As to dependent claim 8, “further comprising a delegated administration definition component for defining delegated administration permissions for users whereby users are selectively enabled to use the delegated administration component to define access policies for specified resources and users” is disclosed in ‘419 col. 6, lines 3-11 “The user draws a graph which starts with a service and a to-from set ... The user is building a decision tree”.

As to dependent claim 9, “in which the delegated administration definition component further comprises a graphical user interface for displaying a grid having nodes, laid out on a first axis and on a second axis, each node corresponding to a variable set of users, potentially including the null set, for which delegated administration permissions are granted, the position of each node relative to the first and second axes in the grid defining the users and the

resources, respectively, for which permissions are granted for the node” is taught in ‘419 col. 6, lines 25-37 “As noted above, in one embodiment each node in the decision tree can be one of two types of node. This first type ... To the user, on the GUI ... the service will ignore filters which do not apply ... The false branch is always a deny service” (i.e. “axis” same as “branch”) (i.e. “null set” same as “ignore”).

As to dependent claim 10, “the graphical user interface further comprising an array of nodes relative to the second axis for defining specified users enabled to modify user data maintained by the computer security service, the position of each node in the array of nodes, relative to the first axis, defining the user data for which the modification of data is enabled” is shown in ‘419 col. 6, lines 4-11 “the user creates a path consisting of the desired options which can include: time, session counts, authentication, encryption, users/group, WWW filters ... The user is building a decision tree”.

As to dependent claim 11, this claim is directed to a computer readable program code of the computer security service of the above claims and is rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ellen C Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8917. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory A Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.


NORMAN M. WRIGHT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Ellen Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2134
22 April 2004